

[19th October 1927]

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" They have the benefit of what they learnt in England in their ordinary administration."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Does it mean that it is confined to their own jurisdiction ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Yes."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know from the hon. the Law Member whether any one of them is an Indian ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" No."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know why Indians were excluded ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Indians have not been deliberately excluded."

Appeals disposed of by the Deputy Inspectors-General of Police.

* 687 Q.—Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of appeals disposed of within the last quinquennium by the Deputy Inspectors-General of Police over the decisions of District Superintendents of Police ; how many were confirmed and how many were reversed or reduced ;

(b) the number of cases in which punishments have been enhanced ;

(c) whether there is any provision of law under which the punishments awarded by the Deputy Superintendents of Police can be enhanced by the Deputy Inspectors-General ;

(d) whether there is any proposal to appoint an Indian District Superintendent of Police as Assistant Inspector-General of Police ; and

(e) if the number of appeals reversed by the Deputy Inspectors-General is very small, whether the Government are considering any proposal to entrust the disposal of these appeals to the Assistant Inspector-General ?

A.—(a) & (b) A statement is laid on the table."

(c) The Government are not aware of any rule or provision of law which forbids such enhancement.

(d) No.

(e) The Government could not accept such a proposal as the Assistant Inspector-General is himself a District Superintendent of Police.

Alleged deceit of the public by Mr. Mangallam David.

* 688 Q.—Mr. G. R. PREMAYYA : Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the investigation of the Police department in the Bapatla taluk, Guntur district, to know if Mr. Mangallam David of Bapatla deceived the public by taking money promising to get them Government land ;

(b) if so, at what stage the matter is at present ;

(c) who is the police officer deputed for its investigation ;

(d) whether he conducted any local enquiries ;

19th October 1927]

(e) whether he consulted the Public Prosecutor at Guntur; if so, what his view is about the case; and

(f) how long this case has been pending with the Police department?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The case has been struck off as a civil dispute under the orders of the Subdivisional Magistrate, Ongole.

(c) The Inspector of Police, Bapatla Circle.

(d) Yes. He examined 58 witnesses in Guntur and Nellore districts.

(e) He did not consult the Public Prosecutor.

(f) For nine months, i.e., from 24th June 1926 to 23rd March 1927.

Jails

Abolition of the differences between Mappilla and non-Mappilla prisoners.

* 689 Q.—MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur: With reference to the answer given to my supplementary question to question No. 328 answered on the 16th March 1927, that he will consider the question of abolishing the difference between the Mappilla and non-Mappilla prisoners and also their families, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state what steps he has taken to abolish all such differences?

A.—If non-Mappilla prisoners in the Andamans want to come to Madras and take their wives and children back to the Andamans with them and if they make a request to the Andaman authorities to that effect, it will be considered by that administration.

MR. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB :—“Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether he means to suggest that the Mappilla prisoners in the Andamans were voluntarily asking the higher authorities to get their families there?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“As I have said on more than one occasion in this House, the Andaman colonization scheme is a voluntary one. The Mapillas do express a desire that they would like to get their families there, and then only arrangements are made.”

Legislation for preventive detention of incorrigible habitual offenders.

* 690 Q.—Kao Sahib R. SRINIVASAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government propose to reconsider the question of initiating legislation for the preventive detention of incorrigible habitual offenders suggested in paragraph 24 of the report on the Administration of Jails for the year 1926; and

(b) whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table a copy of a letter from the Inspector-General of Jails, No. G-1032, dated 30th December 1926, to Government advocating his views on the subject?

A.—(a) The question is under the consideration of Government.

(b) The Government are unable to do so as the subject-matter is one which may call for All-India legislation.